DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 509 CS 207 413

AUTHOR White, Edward M.
TITLE Comparison and Contrast: The 1978 California State University and Colleges Freshman English Equivalency Examination.
INSTITUTION California State Univ. and Colleges, Long Beach.; English Council of the California State Univ. and Colleges.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 90p.; For related documents, see ED 114 825-826 and CS 207 410-415.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Freshmen; Educational Testing; *Equivalency Tests; *Essay Tests; Higher Education; Objective Tests; Scoring; State Programs; Student Placement; Test Format; Testing Programs; *Test Interpretation; Test Norms; Test Reliability; *Writing Evaluation; *Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS California

ABSTRACT

The sixth administration of the California State University and Colleges Freshman English Equivalency Examination, a test consisting of an objective examination scored by California State University and College faculty, is analyzed in this report. After a preface and short index of previous volumes, the first section of the report contains a summary and fact sheet describing the test, its results, and studies being undertaken to examine the results. The next section recounts the actual administration of the test. The section on the examination's two essay questions consists of three subsections, two containing a report from the question leader, the question itself, the directions to graders, and six sample student papers for each of the questions, and the third listing the essay readers. Section four presents a statistical report on the examination scores. The report's four appendixes contain the examination's budget, a survey of student sources of information on the examination, a report from the California State University and Colleges English Council Test Committee on the 1978 examination, and a summary report of descriptive statistics. (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227509

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

COMPARISON AND CONTRAST

THE 1978 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES FRESHMAN ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION

EDWARD M. WHITE
DIRECTOR OF THE PROJECT
FOR
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Linda Bunnell Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS207413

This monograph is one in a series describing the results of projects implemented under the California State University and Colleges Fund for Innovation and Improvement in the Instructional Process.

© 1979 Trustees of The California State University and Colleges

PREFACE

This report describes the sixth administration of The California State University and Colleges Freshman English Equivalency Examination. The development and initial implementation of the program are fully described in the first volume of Comparison and Contrast, which describes the 1973 program. The further development of the program is described in Comparision and Contrast 1974, 1975, 1976, and 1977. Since this 1978 volume will not repeat material already published in the first five reports, anyone seeking a full account of the development of the English Equivalency Examination should acquire the earlier five volumes from the Office of the Chancellor, The California State University and Colleges, 400 Golden Shore, Long Beach, California 90802.

Following the Table of Contents in this volume is a list of materials published in earlier reports that may be of particular interest to those receiving this report, which will go into detail only when new problems or new solutions occurred in 1978. This report does contain the essay questions that were used in 1978, the criteria for scoring, and six sample papers at the different score levels for each question. It also contains descriptive statistics for the 1978 test, a statistical report, and norm figures. This volume is slimmer than past ones, since it does not contain the usual in-progress report of the 1973 follow-up study. That study is nearing completion, and will be published as a separate volume shortly; it will detail the subsequent performance on a wide range of criteria of the total accessible 1973 test group.

The English Equivalency Examination program has been made possible through the continued financial support of the Fund for Innovation and Improvement in the Instructional Process of The California State University and Colleges. This year for the sixth consecutive year all administrative, publication, and essay examination expenses have been covered by this fund. The continued support of the program by the California State University English Council, composed of English Department Chairs and freshmen English coordinators from all 19 campuses of the system, provides the program with a sound professional center.

Finally, it is worthy of note that, as the teaching and measurement of writing skills becomes more and more important at the college and university level, the English Equivalency Examination has served to involve a substantial number of university-level English faculty in the preparation and scoring of an essay examination according to the highest professional and psychometric standards. The continuing

dialogue among the professionals involved in this program on all CSUC campuses has had a substantial effect on the teaching of writing and the teachers of writing throughout the state of California. It may turn out that this "in-service training" byproduct of English Equivalency will be the most important educational impact of the program. At the same time, we should not minimize the effect of the program upon the substantial numbers of students who have directly benefited from it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface i

Short Index of Previous Volumes iv

I. Summary and Fact Sheet 1

II. Administration of the Test Program 9

III. The Essay Test 11

A. Question 1 12

a. Report by Question Leader: Dr. Eileen Lothamer. . 12
b. Question 1 14
c. Directions to Graders 15
d. Six Sample Student Papers 16

B. Question 2 21

a. Report by Question Leader: Dr. Rex Burbank . . . 21
b. Question 2 24
c. Directions to Graders 25
d. Six Sample Student Papers 27

C. Table Chart/Reader Roster, 1978 32

IV. Statistical Report: Dr. Robert Bradley 33

APPENDICES

A. Budget 49

B. Survey of Student Source of Information on the EEE . 50

C. Report of the CSUC English Council Test Committee . . 53

D. Descriptive Statistics: Summary Reports 55

SHORT INDEX OF PREVIOUS VOLUMES

COMPARISON AND CONTRAST 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977

1. Summary and Fact Sheet
   1973: 1 - 13
   1974: 1 - 4
   1975: 1 - 4
   1976: 3 - 6
   1977: 1 - 4

2. The Objective Test
   1973: 28 - 30
   1974: 13

3. The Essay Test: Reports, Questions, Sample Responses
   1973: 30 - 61
   1974: 15 - 39
   1975: 19 - 36
   1976: 11 - 26
   1977: 7 - 18

4. Descriptive Statistics and Statisticians' Reports

   1973: 79-- 93, 132 - 167
   1974: VII - XX, xxiii - xxxvi
   1975: 51 - 68
   1976: 31 - 47, 84 - 97
   1977: 20 - 28

5. Norm Samples
   1973: (7 CSUC campuses + UCLA and UCR): 51 - 61
   1974: (San Jose State, Stanford, UCR, UCSB, UCLA): 41 - 49, VII - XI
   1975: (San Francisco State; CSU, Long Beach): 54 - 62
   1976: (CSU, Northridge; CSU, Chico): 32 - 38
   1977: (CSU, Fullerton; CSU, Long Beach): 21 - 31

6. Follow-up Studies
   1975: 71 - 91
   1976: 48 - 63
   1977: 33 - 48

7. Reports, Appendices, and Charts
   Equivalency Testing in College Freshman English
   1973: 94 - 125
   Budgets
   1973: 126 - 131
   1974: XXI
   1975: 93
   1976: 64
   1977: 48
   Registration Form
   1974: 7
   1975: 7 - 10

English Council Committee Reports
1974: 13
1975: 12 - 16, 17 - 18
Organizational Charts
1975: 94 - 98
1976: 65
1977: 19
Media and Student Questionnaires
1975: 99 - 100
Data Processing Procedures
1975: 37 - 50
Four Issues for Faculty in Equivalency Testing
1975: 101 - 111
The Working of a Controlled Essay Reading
1976: 68 - 75
Son of EEE: The English Placement Test
1977: 57 - 58
The 1977 English Equivalency Reliability Study
1977: 51 - 54

SUMMARY AND FACT SHEET

The 1978 English Equivalency Examination proceeded smoothly, following, in general, the precedents established during the first five administrations. Enrollment for the first time increased rather sharply. It would be encouraging to think that renewed attention to writing in the schools, as shown, for example, by A.B. 65 and the California Writing Project, has increased the number of students who can profit by the EEE. Another possible reason for the increase may be the extra attention the new associate director of the program gave to ensuring statewide distribution of the test brochure. The EEE seems to have become an established part of California education, increasingly well-known.

Certainly, one major indication of the continued success of the program is the number of times it is mentioned as a model for new testing programs, both statewide and on individual campuses. With large-scale testing programs in English now underway in the CSUC and in many other areas of education, the English Equivalency model and experience has become an extremely important base upon which to develop new programs.

The following chart compares the number of applicants, and their success rates, across the six years of the English Equivalency Examination program. It shows the decline in number of enrollments until this year, partially compensated for by the increasing percentage of passing scores.

STUDENTS APPLYING FOR ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION CREDIT 1973-78

	Number	Number Passing	Percent Passing	Semester Units Earned
1973	4,072	1,363	33.5	8,178
1974	3,639	1,036	28.5	6,216
1975	3,303	981	29.7	5,886
1976	2,866	1,093	38.1	6,558
1977	2,216	883	39.8	5,298
1978	2,826	1,165	41.3	6,990
Six-Year Total	18,922	6,581	34.5	39,126

The multiple-choice test continued to be the CLEP Subject Examination, Analysis and Interpretation of Literature, developed and graded by the Educational Testing Service. The essay test was produced by two CSUC Test Development Committees and scored by The California State University and Colleges faculty at the controlled essay reading at Kellogg West on the campus of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, June 10-13, 1978.

In addition to the test papers, readers also scored norm samples written by 488 students from three CSUC campuses (San Jose State University, CSU, Northridge, and CSU, Fresno).

Dr. Robert Bradley, test officer at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, was once again in charge of the statistical operation. As has been the case in the past, the controlled essay reading achieved an extremely high rate of consistency among the readers. A new procedure to record discrepant scores shows that of the 6,648 pairs of scores given by readers, only 338 were more than one point apart and required a third reading (169 for Question 1; 169 for Question 2). The essay scoring followed closely the pattern of previous years, although standards were stiffened slightly. The four independent readings on a 6-point scale were added to yield a single essay test score on a scale from 0-24. Essay total scores of 14 or above when combined with passing scores on the machine-scored test allowed a student to pass; twenty students with a total score of 13, but with objective scores above 60 (that is, above the 85th percentile on national norms) were also allowed to pass.

For the second year, a second level "placement" pass was established. Students passing the test at this level were exempted from the required CSUC English Placement Test, even though their scores were not high enough to deserve credit. Any student with a total essay score of 15 or higher received a placement pass, whatever the multiple-choice score; an essay score of 11 or higher earned this pass when combined with a multiple-choice score of 35 or higher. When we add the 1,250 students (44.2%) who received this placement, or exemption, pass to the 1,164 (41.2%)who received credit for freshman English through the English Equivalency Examination, approximately 85% of the 1978 EEE tests received some form of pass--which means that approximately 85% of the test applicants received some substantial benefit from the test.

Meanwhile, the follow-up study of the 1973 test group nears completion. When printed in 1979, this study should give definite answers to the questions a large-scale equivalency testing program raises for a state university system--in particular to the question of how students gaining credit differ in their course plans and grades from those not gaining credit. The staffing, financial, and educational implications of this study are obviously important.

The 1979 English Equivalency Examination will be offered on April 28, 1979 and the essay will once again be scored by CSUC faculty in the middle of June. The future of the English Equivalency Examination has meanwhile been clouded by the passage of Proposition 13 and the severe budgetary restrictions that have since been imposed upon all state agencies. It seems likely that ways will need to be found to reduce the level of state support for this program, either by increasing student fees (now $20) or decreasing

the amount of the fee now paid to Educational Testing Service for the multiple-choice portion of the test. An extreme solution to the problem would be to replace the existing CLEP portion of the test with a new multiple-choice test developed by CSUC English faculty The 1979 test has been funded but serious consideration of budgetary issues will need to occupy the directors of the program and English Council committees during the next year.

1978 ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION FACT SHEET

Test Date:	April 29, 1978
Test Used:	CLEP Subject Examination, Analysis and Interpretation of Literature (90 minutes) in combination with Two 45-minute essay questions prepared by CSUC English faculty (90 minutes).
Number of Candidates:	2,824
Number Passed:	1,165
Percentage Passed:	41.3%
Number Exempted from Placement Testing	1,250
Percentage Receiving Exemption Pass	44.2%
Number of Semester Credit Units Earned	6,990

Scoring Data:

Minimum Passing Scores for credit:

Objective Part:	45 (CLEP scale) achieved by 62.5%
Essay Part:	14 (out of a possible 24 points; equivalent to 48 on the CLEP scale) achieved by 54.3% (Twenty additional students with scores of 13 and objective scores above 60--above the 85th percentile on national norms--also passed).
Combined Score:	97 (49 objective + 48 essay, each on the CLEP scale) 45.9% achieved 49 or better on the objective test, and 54.3% achieved 48 or better on the essay test.

Minimum Passing Scores for EPT Exemption:

Objective Part:	35
Essay Part:	11 (out of a possible 24 points; equivalent to 37 on the CLEP scale) (Seven additional students with essay scores of 15 or above but objective scores below 35 also passed for EPT exemption).

Mean and Standard Deviation:

Objective Part Mean:	47.831
Standard Deviation:	9.246
Essay Part Mean:	46.979
Standard Deviation:	9.194
Combined Score Mean:	94.810
Standard Deviation:	16.424

Statistical Data

Correlation between CSUC Essay and CLEP Objective Tests:	.58
Reliability:	
CLEP Test:	.88
Essay Test	$.745 \pm .125$
Composite Score:	$.88 \pm .04$

Essay Reading

Number of Readers	36
Number of Colleges Represented:	All 19 CSUC campuses
Grading Scale:	6 point

Number of Readings per Test:	4 (2 independent readings for each question; additional readings to reconcile discrepant grades)
Total Essay Readings:	Approximately 13,500
Weighting and Scaling:	The essay score was converted by the equipercentile method to the CLEP scale (20-80), and the scores on both parts of examination were added. Each part received equal weight.

COMPOSITE
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION SCORING DATA
1973-1978

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Minimum Passing Scores						
Objective Part	45	45	45	45	45	45
Essay Part: Raw score on 0-24 scale (Scaled score on 20-80 scale)	13(48)	13(53)	13(46)	13(48)	14(43)	14(48)
Combined Score	100	105	99	101	92	97
Mean and Standard Deviation						
Objective Part						
Mean	47.448	49.444	47.180	48.995	47.050	47.831
Standard Deviation	8.854	9.001	9.069	9.425	9.119	9.246
Essay Part						
Mean	47.916	48.620	45.291	49.447	44.804	46.979
Standard Deviation	8.402	9.171	8.693	9.107	8.753	9.194
Combined Score						
Mean	95.363	98.064	92.474	98.442	91.854	94.810
Standard Deviation	14.869	15.855	15.402	16.456	15.616	16.424
Statistical Data						
Correlation Between CSUC Essay and CLEP Objective Tests	.4777	.5225	.5037	.5768	.53	.58
Reliability						
CLEP Test	.88	.88	.88	.88	.88	.88
Essay Test	.72±.18	.68±.15	.69±.14	.87±.04	.70±.11	.745±.125
Composite Score	.88±.05	.85±.05	.86±.04	.87±.04	.865±.035	.88±.04

COMPOSITE ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION FACT SHEET

1973 - 1978

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Number of Readers	75	49 -including 4 guest readers	44 -including 2 guest readers	32	32	36
Number of Colleges Represented	All 19 CSUC campuses	All 19 CSUC campuses and UCLA, UCSB, Stanford, and So. Univ. in Baton Rouge,La.	All 19 CSUC campuses and UCLA and the Univ. of Redlands	All 19 CSUC campuses	All 19 CSUC campuses	All 19 CSUC campuses
Number of Readings per Test	4	4	4	4	4	4
Total Essay Readings (Approximately)	20,000	20,000	15,100	14,400	10,000	13,500

Weighting and Scaling

The essay score is converted by the equipercentile method to the CLEP scale (20-80), and the scores on both parts of the examination are added. Each part receives equal weight.

II

ADMINISTRATION OF THE TEST PROGRAM

Once again, Dr. Edward M. White, California State College, San Bernardino, served as director of the test program. Associate Director was Dr. Rex Burbank, San Jose State University. Coordination of test administration took place through the test office of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, under the direction of Dr. Robert Bradley. A new test manual was prepared by Betsy Barlow of the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, New Jersey, and the administration of the test went smoothly.

No changes were made in the existing statistical or computer operation, which allowed the pass and no pass letters to be ready for mailing to all students who took the examination within 24 hours of the end of the essay grading process. For the second year, a second computer operation took place under the supervision of Dr. Bradley, to allow for a second-level pass, for those students not receiving credit but performing well enough to merit exemption from the English Placement Test. (See Comparison and Contrast, 1977, Appendix C for a discussion of the relationship between the EEE and the EPT.)

This year the same procedures that have been used in recent years to develop the essay test questions were again adopted. The advances in essay test development that were begun in 1975 were an important contribution to the field of essay testing and we discovered once again that the time, effort, and money that were put into the creation of each essay question led to questions that were excellent for their purpose and that could be scored with accuracy. A committee based in northern California was under the leadership of Professor Rex Burbank, San Jose State University. The other in the southern part of the state was under the direction of Professor Eileen Lothamer, California State University, Long Beach. Working with each committee chair were three faculty from three different CSUC campuses. Thus, representatives of eight different campuses were involved in developing and pre-testing the essay questions. These committees developed essay questions during the course of the fall term and assigned them to freshmen composition sections on their own campuses for pretesting.

Following pretesting, grading sessions were held by the committees; careful assessment of scoring reliability and grade distributions for each proposed question then took place. Both questions were then revised and once again pretested. By the time the essay questions were ready for printing, the committees were confident that the questions would accurately reflect the students abilities and that these questions contained no ambiguities or other problems that would lead to

difficulty in grading. Results of the grading session in June demonstrated the value of the essay test development procedure. Once again, the questions worked very well, most particularly in allowing escellent students to show how well they could perform without distractions or ambiguities in the questions.

One important conclusion from this procedure is that any large-scale testing program must be prepared to spend both time and money on development of essay test questions. No matter how excellent a question may appear to be to a group of English professors, it may only be considered to be a good essay question after it has been pretested on real students and the resulting essays have been read carefully by trained readers. The readers can then judge whether a full and accurate range of scores is being elicited by that question and whether reliable scoring of the essays is possible. Certainly the essay test development and the essay scoring procedure for the English Equivalency Examination have developed into a highly reliable form of testing with important implications not only for testing but for the development of writing assignments in general. It has become clear to many of the teachers involved in the program that some essay assignments given to students in classroom situations lack the clarity, specificity, and ease of scoring that the English Equivalency Examination essay questions possess.

Finally, the California State University English Council continues to maintain close professional supervision over the entire test program. English Council committees evaluate the aims and procedures of the program and continue to support the test program by votes affirming the recommendations of these committees. (See Comparison and Contrast, 1975, p. 12 and Appendix C below.) The Council has suggested that campus English Departments use the fact that they sponsor the test to "improve relationships and communication between our departments and the high schools." Campus English departments continue to invite the program directors to speak at articulation meetings, and most of those meetings open new avenues of communication between the departments and local high school and community college English teachers. Only through continued participation by the English Council will the test continue to have the confidence of the English faculties throughout the system and continue to deserve that confidence.

III

THE ESSAY TEST

The essay portion of the English Equivalency Examination consists of two 45-minute writing tasks. Each of the assigned topics is designed to examine a different set of writing skills, through a different kind of topic. Students thus write on two separate questions in two different rhetorical modes. Since the total essay score combines the four scores given to the two essays, the test allows some compensation for students who may write very well in one mode but not as well in another. However both modes of writing are frequent in college composition classes, and skill in both is normally expected.

The correlation between the two questions has, over the years, been about .4; this rather low correlation supports the assumption that the two questions are examining related but different skills.

The first question is in the expressive/analytic mode. It asks the student to describe something from his or her personal experience, and to speculate in some way upon the meaning of whatever is described. Each year, a committee develops a specific topic following this pattern. This question examines the student's ability to describe something in precise language, to organize that description in orderly sentences and paragraphs, and to use some abstract reasoning in relation to that description.

The second question is in the expository/analytic mode. It asks the student to read with care two passages on roughly the same topic, and to compare and contrast them. Each year, a committee develops a specific topic following this pattern. This question examines the student's ability to read with comprehension, to discern similarities and differences between complex quotations, and to develop an organized essay discussing coherently these similarities and differences.

The sections that follow describe the evolution of the two questions that were used in 1978, give the questions, the criteria used to score them, and, finally, sample papers at each discrete score level.

A. Question 1

a. The following report was prepared by Dr. Eileen Lothamer, Question Leader for Question 1.

Summary Report on Question 1

Question One for the 1978 English Equivalency Examination was designed and pretested by a committee of four experienced state university English Department faculty (Elaine Osio, Los Angeles; John White, Fullerton; Agnes Yamada, Dominguez Hills; Eileen Lothamer, Chairman, Long Beach). Having worked together on the previous year's enterprise, all of the committee members quickly settled to the tasks of creating evocative, experience-based topics, classroom testing them, establishing scoring guides, and comparing range of response and quality in order to arrive at a final, single topic for statewide use.

At the first meeting, October 27, each member brought scored samples on three classroom-tested topics, twelve topics to consider for fullness of response and effectiveness for holistic scoring. Two topics were then chosen to receive further classroom testing before the next meeting of the committee, with a rough scoring guide to be established on the evidence of the papers themselves.

At the second meeting, December 15, the committee scored the samples presented and discussed the individual scoring guides as well as the possible problem with the first-choice topic, a provocative one which unfortunately, for some students, involved some demanding analogical reasoning. To aid more students over that metaphoric hump a revised form of the question was created for further classroom testing and evaluation. Three forms were now to be sampled, scored and evaluated before the final meeting.

At its third meeting, March 2, 1978, the members scored each others' samples, debated at length the limitations of both questions, one likely to cut weaker students off from full expression given a forty-five minute time limit, but other likely to generate facile generalizations without specifics. Following full discussions of the varied merits of the topics and student responses, the committee voted to go with the second-choice questions, rewriting it to strengthen the demand for concreteness and to clarify the nature of the writing assignment. We chose to serve the many rather than the analogically-favored few. We also chose, as a consequence, to refine the scoring guide derived to aid training for reader reliability. At this meeting, then, the final wording of the questions, refining of the scoring guide, and selecting of samples took place.

The evening before the statewide scoring meeting June 10, the chief reader read through some eight batches of student booklets to get even fresher, live examples to begin training. Both classroom tested and "live" samples were then ready for the Saturday training which began with a morning session, during which the question leader and table leaders (Dan Buerger, San Jose; Larry Kramer, San Bernardino; Dick Suter, Pomona) conferred on samples to reiterate concern with holistic reading and use of the scoring guide. Table leaders worked through fourteen samples (covering the whole six-point scale), scoring and checking against the guide. In addition, table leaders read through live batches to gain a larger sense of student response and possible reader problems. What we noticed then was borne out during the subsequent reading. Students grouped themselves into personal object/significance vs. category/societal commentary; for example, one student might select a journal, photo album, and records to illustrate his life during the 1970's; whereas, anotner would allude to calculators, microwave ovens, and videotapes to illustrate the larger life of which he was a part in the 1970's. This dichotomy worried us all on the surface, throughout the meeting, but ultimately the process won out if our reader reliability figures and the passing rate are any indication. However, next year's committee will keep a weather eye out.

The afternoon full session began with a review of the scoring procedure. As with previous examinations, responses were scored by two readers, and, where discrepancies of two or more points occurred, by a third reader. Throughout the reading, moreover, table leaders provided continual spot checks of each reader, particularly monitoring tendencies to score low or without sufficient reference to the scoring guide. Initially, all readers, veterans and novices alike, were given six carefully selected samples which they scored, discussed at table and then discussed in comparative batches of three on a room-wide basis. Question One readers were then eager to begin actual reading. Despite their zeal, however, readers were asked to score and justify choices on two more samples following our afternoon break. With only one readily apparent exception, the readers adjusted quickly to the task and set a wondrous reading and reliability rate.

Checks by the table leaders, room discussion of samples, table selection of a live sample for circulation and scoring, question leader evaluation of table leaders and readers--all of these familiar tachniques were used to aim for concensus and reliability. We are modestly pleased with the results but intend to aim even higher.

And, although we did not expect perfection from even the best papers, we were consistently surprised by the quality of 5 and 6 level papers. There were ultimately not many surprises from the artifacts, mementoes, momentos, objects--all variously spelled, including the word descendant/ent on the question itself. But if we were not surprised neither were the students. It was difficult for any but the most hostile student to construct a non-response paper. Stunning selections of objects we seldom had, but thoughtful commentary of the obvious we did. Evidence indicated that the topic and the construction of the writing assignment provided a fit arena for the display of writing ability, and we hope that some of the "artifacts" that follow suggest the levels of response we encountered. We cannot be sure, though, for as one student noted, "Time and people are always on the move, always progressing to an unknown infinity, but we do not know this for certain."

b. **QUESTION 1.** The following question was distributed to all students:

You have 45 minutes to write on the following topic.

PLEASE READ AND THINK ABOUT THE FOLLOWING:

There has been a renewal of interest in one's roots, in one's heritage. Young people are searching out their family history and avidly reconstructing their ancestors' lives from various artifacts -- pictures, clothing, jewelry, etc. But what kind of past will we leave our descendants?

If you could preserve three or four mementos -- artifacts -- that might help those a hundred years from now to understand your life in the 1970's what might you pick?

WRITING ASSIGNMENT:

-- Describe the artifacts you chose.

-- Explain why you have chosen them.

-- Comment on what your descendants might learn about you from them.

c. The following directions for scoring were distributed to all readers engaged in the grading of Question 1.

Students should be rewarded for what they do well in response to the question. Here students are set a three-fold task: to describe those mementos they would choose to preserve, to explain their choices, and to comment on what their descendants might learn about them from the artifacts.

Note that the question calls for description and analysis. Students may choose to describe objects which are personal or objects which reflect the culture of the 1970's. In some papers the analysis may be implied through description, but such implication should be appropriate to the approach used by the student.

An extremely well-written response may be scored a point higher than it would be scored on the basis of content alone. A poorly written response may be scored a point lower.

POSSIBLE SCORES:

6 A superior response will address itself to all aspects of the question. Though it may have occasional faults, it will be well-organized, detailed, and generally well-written.

5-4 These scores will be useful for a well-handled paper which is weak in some aspects of the superior response; e.g., it may slight one of the parts of the question; it may have some minor grammatical inconsistencies. Otherwise, the paper should be competently written. Remember that a four is an upper-half paper.

3 This score will be useful for the following kinds of papers:

-- those which are only descriptive;
-- those which are only explanations of choice;
-- those in which the language is overly clichéd;
-- those which are overly repetitious;
-- those which are general and superficial.

2 This score is to be used for papers which exhibit serious weaknesses in structure, syntax, diction, and/or development.

1 This score is to be used for papers which show very little understanding of the question or suggest incompetence in structure, syntax, and diction.

* Non-response papers or those which argue with or avoid the question should be given to the table leader.

d. The following student responses to Question 1 were sample papers used during the reading to illustrate the grades on the 6-point scale:

SCORE OF ONE

If given the oppertunity to preserve three or four artifacts from my life time, my choice would be three News papers. The first newspaper would be from the date of my berth. This would give my descendents an understand of the world setting at the start of my time on earth. The secound would be from my midle years, showing the events that shaped my life, that cause me to act as I did. The third paper would be from the date of my death. It would show the world setting at the end of my time on earth.

I hope that these papers would show how the world change during my life. If so, they would give my descendents an idea of why I lived my life the way I did. The news papers could show the changing life style, the advancing technoledgy, and hopfully mans wisdom in using that technoledgy. I wish could preserve these three news papers, so that my decendents could see my life time not in a history book, but rather as I saw it.

SCORE OF TWO

How will our descendents know what our lifestyle is like? They may read about us in books, but reading history--possibly only one mans account of the past--may not satisfy their desire to know more about us. I think that if I would want my descendents to know more about me in the future, I could help them by preserving some of the things that are a part of my life now. Things like radio, television, and recordings of music would be representive of my life style.

The things I think they could use to study my life style are family albums, recordings of music and conversations, and clothing.

Family albums would be helpful to future history buffs because photographs are an excellent record of the past. Actual pictures of people, houses, cars, and anything else that makes up this era would allow them to see exactly what we look like, what forms of transportation we used, what forms our architecture took, etc.

In the past, people did not have the means to record what happened to them and what their lifestyle was like. that we have.

SCORE OF THREE

As a young person of today, I feel it is very important to know the heritage of one's roots. Without this knowledge it is impossible for a society to grow and prosper as ours has done. If people didn't know what life was like years and years ago, what would stop them from making the same mistakes as our ancestors did? We might fight some of the same wars over again just because we did

not know what the cause of them were. That is why it is so important to keep artifacts safe so people hundreds of years from now will be able to see what our life was like and learn by it.

If I could preserve three artifacts, I feel the most important of those would be books. Books to tell what our life is like, the history before us and the present history. Books to tell about our religions, our life style, and our cultures. Also fictional books, to tell them what kind of people we were and what kind of fantasies we have.

The next thing I would leave would be pictures. It is one thing to read about our history and culture, but to truely understand you must be able to see it. Then they could see what our cities and towns looked like. They could see pictures of the people and what we looked like. It would be so much easier to relate with our societies if they could see actual photographs of us, instead of just hand drawn pictures. I feel our society would be much more advanced right now if we had photographs of the cave man or the prehistoric animals. No one actually knows what they looked like, we can just get an idea by their bones.

The last artifact I chose is a very important one. I would like to save, if it were my ancestors, a personal letter from me; maybe a diary. I would tell them many of my feelings and what it's like to live here during this age. If one of my relatives one hundred years ago left me a diary I think it would really help me understand what life was like back then.

If life were destroyed for many hundreds of years here on earth, when it started to rebuild, I feel these artifacts would be very beneficial to them. It would help them rebuild their society and not make the same mistakes again that destroyed us. That is why it is so important to keep these artifacts safe and preserved.

SCORE OF FOUR

As I have found it to be interesting to look into my own roots, I believe it to be important for me to leave some items that can represent my own self to my descendents. It gives a person a feeling of belonging to have some sort of understanding of his ancestoral background. And this feeling of belonging can result in a self assurance that can be very beneficial to one's life.

My personal choices as mementos to leave for my descendents should, I believe, represent as broad a view of my character as possible. My first choice as an artifact for the future generations would have to be an album of photographs. Something of this nature would be invaluable in many respects when what could be learned is considered. For instance,

photographs have the ability to capture attitudes, feelings, and special moments without losing the sense of spontaneity that is ever present in our lives. Photographs are able to portray the social classes of which we are a part and some of the daily rituals of life within those classes. Also, they offer a special insight into the tastes, likes and dislikes which make each of us an individual.

Secondly, I'd like to leave a journal to posterity. Contained in this journal could be a daily account of life as I know it and also the opinions not only of myself, but of society in general. This type of artifact would surely give any descendent a better understanding of why history has taken a particular course and how he and also his ancestors have fit into the plan of life. This would also help my descendents to see exactly where I stood in relation to my peers. And I believe this point to be extremely important as far as giving our descendents an opportunity to objectively evaluate those of us here today.

And finally, I would leave to my descendents a tape recording of my own voice commenting on myself and my surroundings. From this tape, future generations of my family would be able to hear and possible study the particular dialect which I speak, offering an infallable medium through which so many fine points of a person's character could be analyzed. This would eliminate any subjectivity which I might have subconsciously placed in any of the other artifacts I have chosen to leave behind. And in this tape I would offer whatever advice I might feel confident of, after achieving whatever wisdom I should through the course of my lifetime.

SCORE OF FIVE

Following the television show "Roots", a widespread interest in family history has been seen. The artifacts we have obtained from our ancestors have enabled us to understand more about them and more about their lives. To help my descendents understand my life in the 1970's would be difficult because of its complexity. There are three items, however, which would give some understanding of my life.

The first item, or artifact, my descendents might find would be a musical instrument--a clarinet. The clarinet is a brown, slender instrument which uses a reed made from bamboo to produce music. The tone of a clarinet can be dark and deep, or bright and clear. The variability of the tone is one reason for choosing this instrument. It is symbolic of the various moods of the musician. Another reason for the choice of a musical instrument is to show my love for music. It's not only beautiful to listen to, but it's a way of expressing myself. My descendents would learn that I loved music in all of its forms, just as others of my generation did.

My generation is also very "sports-minded" and aware of the outdoors. This is one reason for choosing a swimsuit as a momento. The suit would be a one-piece designed for competetive swimming. I would choose it to show my interest in in sports and the outdoors, but it would teach my descendents other things as well. For example, to swim competetively a person must be disciplined and trained. This shows a bit of sacrificing on my part--to better myself as well as enjoy myself. It also shows that I realize the necessity of being healthy and having interactions with others. The sport of swimming competively demand that you support others. The specific style of my suit might teach them that I wanted to look my best at what ever I was doing, and that I wanted to be the best person possible.

Being the best I can be, as an individual, is the reason I would choose the Bible as my third artifact. It looks like other books on the outside, but it is unlike any other book on the inside. I would choose the Bible because it is what I base my life on from day to day. I live by its principles. The clarinet and swimsuit are parts of my life being expressed, but the Bible is where I "find" me and learn how to express myself. My descendents will learn that I believe in Christ--as my Savious and Lord--and that even though I enjoy sports, (swimming) and music, and the other material things of this world, that I know that the things to come, which will be in heaven, are important to me.

SCORE OF SIX

What to put into a time capsule? A set of encyclopedias or a dictionary would be of little use to future descendents since an encyclopedia only records known history, not current lifestyles, and a dictionary cannot tell anyone how a man lives in the 1950's. Money would be of no sociological benefit, although it may have future financial worth as historic artifacts. Perhaps the only artifacts that should be included are a Sears & Roebuck catalog, a newspaper dated near the end of the year, and a copy of the films of four American families, shown on public broadcasting several months ago.

A Sears & Roebuck catalog is relatively small, and easy to obtain. Not only will descendents one hundred years from now be able to see the clothing styles, but also our technological state of development. From the photos of clothing, and the styles, a descendent might be able to speculate on our present society's moral value (a mini skirt could indicate lax standards); the cost of such items would also help indicate our economic status, and the relative value of clothing as compared to a lawnmower. From the assortment of tools and utensels displayed in the catalog, a descendent could estimate our technology

(whether we have invented an atomic toothbrush, or not), and, from the majority of products using electricity, he could deduce our primary energy, and our dependence on it. Therefore, a Sears & Roebuck catalog effectively covers our material lifesytle, what we use, and what we make.

A newspaper or magazine is an excellent source of information on political and social activities. A newspaper printed late in the year is likely to have a general review of the year's top news storeis, giving the reader, our descendant, an overall view of current events, and topics. A newspaper or magazine, then, would be an excellent choice for a time capsule since it provides information on our social activities, and how we relate to each other (war or detenté).

Perhaps the most important artifact would be the films of four American families from PBS. Not only would these films show how typical families live, but also how we use products. These films would reveal to a descendant the use of such things as coffee makers, calculators, and refrigerators, and how they affect our life. The interaction between the family members would depict our social life. Best of all, all things would be in action, clothing worn, machines used, and topics discussed.

Of course, a magazine, a Sears & Roebuck catalog, and a set of films would only be beneficial in describing our 1970's lifestyle if our descendents had eyes and ears to see and hear them. Even if they could see and hear they must be able to understand our writing, or our speech. But, this is a chance that is taken no matter what is included in a time capsule.

B. Question 2

a. The following report was prepared by Dr. Rex Burbank, question leader for Question 2.

Summary Report on Question 2

Essay Question 2 was developed by a faculty committee comprised of Professors Jack Conner, CSU, Hayward; Patricia Brenner, CSPU, San Luis Obispo; Ray McKnight, CSU, Fresno; and I, who served as chairman. All members of the Development Committee are members of the English Departments of their respective universities.

The Committee met three times during the fall and winter, 1977-78. At the first meeting, each member brought at least four topics for consideration by the committee as a whole. All together, sixteen topics were submitted, and of the sixteen, four were selected for pretesting, each committee member having one topic pretested at his/her campus. At the second meeting (all meetings were held at San Jose State University), the committee read the student papers, written by students who had already completed or were then near completion of a second term of freshman English, and selected the most successful of the four topics. In making its selection, the committee evaluated the pretested topics in accordance with the following standards:

1. Their capability of being scored holistically.
2. Their capability of being scored on a six-point scale, with a six as the highest and a one as the lowest score.
3. Their capability of generating responses from all the student examinees--could all high school students taking the test be reasonably and fairly expected to write on the topic?
4. Their capability of producing responses that had a structural arrangement (specifically, comparison and contrast) that could provide a foundation for group scoring.

Only one of the topics satisfied the standards we had set, but we found--as we had in previous years--that the directions needed to be revised so as to indicate more clearly that the topic called upon the student to do four specific and equally important things. The committee revised the directions accordingly, and the topic was pretested once more at San Jose State. After agreeing, at the third meeting, that the topic was a good one, the committee drafted a scoring guide and selected a dozen samples to be used at the reading at Kellogg West in June. Those samples, along with the scoring guide, were reproduced at San Jose State and taken by me to the reading.

As in previous years, Question 2 this year was designed to suggest an organizing principle upon which the student-examinee could write a 45-minute essay. It included two quotations, one from Thomas Hardy's poem "The Man He Killed" and the other from "Remarks Made at

the Peace Banquet (1904)" by William James. The assignment was to write an essay describing the situation portrayed in Hardy's poem and the author's attitude toward it, indicating the extent to which the poem illustrates the point made in James' comment, and showing the degree to which the poem contradicts the James passage. The suggested structure therefore was one calling for analysis, comparison, and contrast. With such an organizational principle set forth by the assignment, the student was afforded a ready-made framework within which to develop his/her thoughts about the two passages. The scoring guide was constructed to enable readers to score all essays by the same qualitative standards and was designed as a brief, general description of the papers--from strongest to weakest--readers could expect; the samples illustrated the qualities specified for each of the six points of the scale in the scoring guide.

At nine a.m., Saturday, June 10, I met with the three table leaders assigned to Question 2. We went through the twelve samples and found that our scorings were remarkably close to the first ones assigned by the Test Development Committee. We were thus ready for the afternoon training session with the readers, who gathered at 1:00 p.m.

In the afternoon, the readers met with the table leaders and me and discussed the question, how it was developed, and the basis upon which it was to be scored. They read and scored samples of 2 and 3 and 5 and 6 papers, and I explained the rationale of the scoring and referred them to the scoring guide. They read and scored more samples and discussed them among themselves at the tables. At 3:00 p.m. I asked the table leaders if they felt their readers were ready to begin "live" readings; all three said yes, and so the reading began. At 4:00 p.m. three more samples were distributed and read, and the reading day ended at five o'clock with a review of the scoring standards.

All together 30 samples were used during the reading. In addition to the twelve we started with we located twenty more from among the papers being checked by the table leaders. These we had xeroxed by the aides. We used fewer samples the second than the first day, and fewer the third than the second. Table leaders spent all their time checking the scores of readers at their table. Readers were asked to adjust their scoring in accordance with the scores given the samples by the table leaders. In addition to sampling, table leaders read and scored the papers themselves, and recorded both their own and the readers' scores on a "check sheet." The table leaders, who read and scored the papers without looking at the scores assigned by the readers, brought the checklist with the test booklets to me, and I then read and scored them myself without looking at the scores given by the readers and table leaders. I was thus able to check continually the scoring of the readers and table leaders against my own. Where there were discrepancies, I could locate who was grading inaccurately and see that a correction was made; and where trends developed--such as a tendency to grade too high or too low or settle in the 3-4 range, the problem could be attacked immediately by further sampling and discussion of

scoring standards. Using these methods, we achieved a high degree of agreement between first and second readers, and in about 95% of the cases the two readings produced scores that were within one point of each other. When a spread of two or more points occurred, the paper was read a third time, by one of the table leaders or by me. The number of papers with a spread of three points was very small, and those were radically uneven in quality, so that the discrepancies were understandable. I am satisfied that overall the papers were graded with a very high degree of uniformity, reliability and validity.

In scoring the essays we did not expect perfection from even the best student responses, but for a score of six we required that the paper show a high degree of skill in achieving what was asked in the assignment. The best demonstrated the student's ability to build on the implied organization with meaningful details, to develop the general points, and display a high degree of understanding of the quotations. Readers understood and took into account the fact that students were required to read two rather sophisticated passages and then to write meaningful commentaries on them in a matter of only 45 minutes--a demanding task; nevertheless, in order to be awarded the highest score, examinees were expected to demonstrate evidence of ability to perceive the complexities implicit in the quotations and to relate them in clear, standard written English.

Rex Burbank
August, 1978

b. QUESTION 2. The following question was distributed to all students

The Man He Killed

"Had he and I but met
By some old ancient inn,
We should have set us down to wet
Right many a nipperkin

"But ranged as infantry
And staring face to face,
I shot at him as he at me,
And killed him in his place.

"I shot him dead because--
Because he was my foe,
Just so: my foe of course he was;
That's clear enough, although

"He thought he'd 'list, perhaps,
Off-hand-like--just as I--
Was out of work--had sold his traps--
No other reason why.

"Yes; quaint and curious war is
You shoot a fellow down
You'd treat, if met where any bar is,
Or help to half a crown."

Thomas Hardy

Wet. . . .nipperkin: have some drinks together

'list: enlist

traps: personal belongings

Half a crown: British coin worth two shillings and sixpence

"Man, biologically considered, and whatever else he may be into the bargain, is simply the most formidable of all the beasts of prey, and, indeed, the only one that preys systematically on its own species."

William James, Remarks at the Peace Banquet (1904)

formidable: inspiring fear
preys: attacks, hunts

ASSIGNMENT:

- - Describe the situation portrayed in Hardy's poem and the speaker's attitude toward it.

- - To what extent does the poem illustrate James' point?

- - To what extent does it contradict James?

c. The following directions for scoring were distributed to all readers engaged in the grading of Question 2.

The student is asked to write an essay which explains (1) the situation portrayed in the poem by Hardy, (2) the speaker's attitude towards the situation, (3) the extent to which the poem illustrates the point of the James passage, and (4) the degree to which the poem contradicts James' point. Papers should be scored for their overall quality, and the student should be rewarded for what she/he does well, but an essay that does not fulfill the four parts of the assignment should not ordinarily be given more than a 3.

An especially well-written essay may be scored a point higher than it would be scored on the basis of content alone. A poorly written response may be scored a point lower.

SCORES

6 A superior response will be a well-organized essay that addresses the four parts of the assignment. It will relate briefly the dramatic situation in the poem; explain the speaker's attitude towards killing the other man--perceiving directly or implicitly the irony of it; show where the two selections are similar; and indicate how the poem and prose passage differ in meaning. Essays in this category will interpret the quotations intelligently and coherently, though they may have minor errors in interpretation. An essay receiving a score of six will display a high degree of competence generally but may have slight flaws in writing. A 6 essay will support generalizations with appropriate details.

5 Essays in this category will address all parts of the assignment, display good overall interpretations of both passages, and clearly demonstrate competence, but they may be less fluent or thoroughly developed than the 6 papers, contain some inaccuracy in interpretation of one passage, or reveal minor grammatical errors or occasional awkwardness of expression.

4 Essays in this group will be generally well written but may lack the development of 6 and 5 papers, perceive similarities and differences in the passages somewhat less accurately, or have some errors in sentence construction or diction. They may deal with one aspect of the assignment by implication rather than by direct statement.

3 Essays in this category may show signs of clear writing but respond to only two or three parts of the assignment; contain misinterpretations of both passages; radically misinterpret one passage; show evidence of serious deficiencies in writing; or lack sufficient details to support their generalizations.

2 Essays assigned a 2 may radically misinterpret both passages; reveal serious faults in writing; display considerable irrelevance; be simplistic.

1 Essays given a 1 show almost no understanding of the question or passages and the writing shows incompetence in sentence construction, usage and idiom.

Non-response papers and those completely off-topic should be given to table leaders.

d. The following student responses to Question 2 were sample papers used during the reading to illustrate the grades on the 6-point scale:

SCORE OF ONE

Two men are in a Bar having a few drinks. it seems that they got mad at each other and one man killed the other. hardy's attitude seems to be one of caloused information, something like a new-cast.

Jame's seems to think that man is the only beast that "preys systematically on it's own species. The way hardy presents the killing thats how it seem. Step by step, very "systematically".

hardy's poem is talking about man in the human sense not biologically, like James states.

SCORE OF TWO

The poem presents a situation of contemplation taking place following an incident in battle between two men of oppossing armies. The narration of the victorious soldier presents a personal apprasial and speculation of his opponents motives bringing each to battle and suggests in afterthought possible alternatives in agreement of like diversions. The poems leaves with the same aire of contemplation and searching thought as its opening stanza.

It contradicts James for the most part in the "James statment" systematically preys" is questionable in light of the Poems overpowering contemplation being in contradiction to an almost mehanical atittude in functioning proposed in the interpretation "preying systematically".

It can illustrat James point in the ease with which surcumstance brought the narrator to war and his seeming unfimiliarity of and questioning his own motives.

SCORE OF THREE

When men are in certain situations they act according to the situation. Even though if they were in another given place in time they would act differently. The situation in Hardy's poem is very sad, but in most cases is very true. There are 2 young men fighting on different sides, no knowing even the others name. They ar at war and their job is to kill their enemyes. They fought against each other and one of them must die. The boy who is telling us of his feelings, sees the irony of war. He knows that he

must kill, but then he says if he would meet the same "foe" in a bar he would probably buy a drink for him. So really how much of an enemy can he be? Both of the boys joined the infrantry because they were out of work and the idea came to them and they decided to act upon it. It was very off hand probably just so they could eat and drink something besides nothing.

William James spoke to a group at a PEACE Banquet. He told them that man is simply the most feared of all the beasts of the earth and the only one that will track down and kill its own species. What he is saying is that man will systematically attack and try to destroy his own kind. Given a situation such as war, man will draw up plans of attack and whoever is the enemy will be killed. The men do not know personally the enemies only the acts which come about from the enemies. He does'nt even know who really is responsable for the acts. This is the feeling the boy gives up in his poem about the "Man he Killed. He didn't know him, they were only on different sides and the two sides were fighting against each other. And one of them must "Win." War is a continuous battle against the principles of man, not the individual. When will man realize this and fight against the real problem not against each other?

SCORE OF FOUR

In the poem The Man He Killed, Hardy describes the thoughts and feelings of a man who has just killed another in battle. He may not have wanted to kill this man, and in fact, were the circumstances different, they may have been friends. He supposed his foe to have had the same qualities he has, the same reasons for enlisting, however, being on opposite sides in the war, made these things unimportant, and he killed the man anyway.

William James reinforced the irony of the situation discribed in the poem, by claiming that man systematically preys on its on species. The poem illustrates his point by the seemingly unemotional way a man killed a person he could have been friends with, but shot for the sake of the war.

In a way though, the poem contradicts James' point. The man may not have wanted to kill his enemy and in an ordinary situation would not have. He was not a beast of prey, he was a soldier defending his country. He knew it was wrong to kill, and was not doing it for himself. (He felt he could have been friends with the man.) Biologically, he was not a killer, as James claims man to be, he was simply a victim of war.

37

SCORE OF FIVE

The poem "The Man He Killed" by Thomas Hardy, depicts a situation which arises time and again during the course of a war.

As we all realize, war involves the concentrated effort by opposing groups to kill each other. When taken in the context of group action, this can sometimes be presented in such a way as to make sense. When viewed in the context of the actions and reactions of individuals acting under these circumstances, these arguments break down.

Hardy depicts a situation when one soldier has just met face to face with an individual soldier of the opposing army, and has shot him dead. The living soldier then begins to ponder upon the paradoxical nature of himself ending the life of an individual towards whom he felt no malice. Indeed, the narrator ponders the two principles meeting under different curcumstances, specifically in a tavern. Here he envisages the two men drinking and being friendly, a result solely of the difference in the circumstances under which they met.

The narrator goes on to ponder the almost frivolous nature of the fate which brought the two principles together. He considers the situation which brought about his enlistment in the infantry. He was out of work, sold all of his possessions, and in a rather off hand manner enlisted under similar circumstances.

The narrator in not able to draw any definitive conclusions from these thoughts, but realizes what a curious phenomenon war is, in that it causes individuals to kill each other when by all rights they may just as easily have been friends.

This poem illustrates to a great extent the nature of man depicted by William James in his "Remarks at the Peace Banquet." The point of James' "Remarks" is that man is the most fear inspiring beast of prey, being the only one which will systematically prey on his own species.

In the poem we see a man who has no particular individual reason to kill, but who nonetheless involves himself in this action. Not acting on his own, he is involved in a mutual attempt by opposing groups to systematically wipe each other out.

This man truly is a formidable beast of prey. He has killed, and considers "quaint and curious" the situation which has brought him to kill an individual to whom he bears no malice. James is correct in his analysis of one who kills without immediates personal reason as being fear inspiring, and Hardy

does an excellent job of exemplifying this point in his poem.

Furthermore, James points out that man is the only beast which systematically preys on his own species, and Hardy's poem illustrates man as the formidable beast of prey precisely in this circumstance.

The narrator in Hardy's poem not only realizes that he has murdered without neccesity and will do it again, but also that there seems to be no reason for this. Indeed, he sees the capriciousness of circumstances developing the way they have.

In all respects, the poem by Hardy illustrates in sharp focus the thrust of James' argument in his "Remarks." Man is a formidable beast of prey. This is clearly illustrated by Hardy, by a character who almost, but not quite, is able to reach the same conclusion. Additionally, this fact is made clear while the narrator is engaged in systematically preying upon his own species, which is the second main point of James' "Remarks".

SCORE OF SIX

The situation portrayed in Hardy's poem is one of irony. On one hand, had he met this man in a bar, instead of on the battle field, they might have had a drink together. This man is said to be his enemy. Although he knows nothing of this man, they shoot at each other and the other man dies.

You realize farther into the poem that this mans probably only enlisted for lack of work as he states, "He thought he'd list, perhaps, off-hand like--just as I--was out of work--had sold his traps--No other reason why" Hardy seems to touch on the stupidity of the human race. Why should a man stand and shoot a perfect stranger dead? Is that justified by saying, "He is my enemy"? Hardy's attitude is one of curiosity as to how this can occur between rational human beings. Hardy and James are very close in thought. James and Hardy both bring out the point that humans should not prey upon other human beings. It is barbaric and seemingly for the lower forms of animals. James states that we are the most fearful animal because we prey systematically upon each other. In war, it is not as if every individual enemy has done something specifically to anger you. We plan our strategies and come up with the best war methods. Hardy's poem is really an example of the kind of thing James is talking about.

There is only one point in which Hardy seems to contradict James. The speaker in, The Man He Killed, seems to be an emotional, feeling individual. He seems to regret what he has done and can not just rationalize it away.

He thinks of this person as another person and not just "the enemy", and can picture himself and the other man in similar situations.

James, on the other hand, groups humans together and looks at them from a more scientific point of view. He speaks of humans as being "beasts of prey", and he is much more negative in his approach.

Hardy shows both the savage and human sides while James states basically the same things without showing any human side to it.

C. TABLE CHART/READER ROSTER

June Essay Reading 1978

Question 1

Dr. Eileen Lothamer
Question Leader

Table 1

Larry Kramer
CSC, San Bernardino
Shelby Steele
San Jose State University
Agnes Yamada
CSU, Dominguez Hills
Jake Fuchs
CSU, Hayward
Ray McKnight
CSU, Fresno
James Kohn
San Francisco University

Table 2

Dan Buerger
San Jose State University
John White
CSU, Fullerton
Sally Ewen
Sonoma State University
Mike Flachman
CSC, Bakersfield
Vic Lams
CSU, Chico
Jon Price
CSU, Sacramento

Table 3

Dick Suter
CSPU, Pomona
John Cleman
CSU, Los Angeles
Bob Burroughs
Humboldt State University
Pat Brenner
CPSU, San Luis Obispo
Glen Sandstrom
San Diego State University
William Walsh
CSU, Northridge

Dr. Rex Burbank
Question Leader

Table 4

Tony Arthur
CSU, Northridge
Sam Bullen
Sonoma State University
Lillian Wilds
CSPU, Pomona
Jack Conner
CSU, Hayward
Margaret Doane
CSC, San Bernardino
J. Barry Dalsant
Humboldt State University

Table 5

Alice Brekke
CSU, Long Beach
Lennis Dunlap
CSU, Chico
Katherine Carter
CSU, Los Angeles
Charles May
CSU, Long Beach
Keith Neilson
CSU, Fullerton
Hortense Thornton
CSU, Sacramento

Table 6

David Rankin
CSU, Dominquez Hills
Kenneth Seib
CSU, Fresno
Ruth Brown
San Diego State University
Alfred Landwehr
CPSU, San Luis Obispo
Michael Cartwright
CSC, Bakersfield
Barbara Quevedo
CSC, Stanislaus

IV. STATISTICAL REPORT

August 1978

Robert Bradley[1]

I. The Test.

The sixth administration of the California State University English Equivalency Examination was conducted on Saturday, April 29, 1978.[2] The test has two ninety-minute sections; the first is an objective, multiple choice part, and the second is an essay part with two questions. The "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature" Subject Examination of the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) was used as the objective part of the test. The two questions of the essay section were developed and scored by the English professors of the California State University and Colleges.

II. Scores.

1) Objective Score. The objective part of the test was scored by the Educational Testing Service, and scores were reported on the CLEP Subject Examination scale, which ranges from 20 to 80.

2) Essay Reading Scores. Each of the two essay questions was graded by two readers, and scores were given on a scale of 1 to 6. For a single reading of a question, a score of 4 or higher represented a passing performance. A zero indicated that the student did not attempt to answer the question.

3) Essay Question Score. The scores for the first and second readings of each question were combined to produce a question score, which ranged from 0 to 12.

4) Raw Essay Total Score. The two questions scores were added to produce a raw essay total score. This score fell between the limits of 0 and 24.

5) Converted Essay Score. The raw essay total scores were transformed to the same scale as the objective scores to permit the addition of objective and essay scores in a meaningful way.

6) Composite Score. The objective score and the converted essay score for each person were added to produce a composite score. Since both the objective and the converted essay scores are expressed on a 20 to 80 scale, the composite scores ranged from 40 to 160.

---

[1]I wish to thank Dr. John Bianchini, Head, Statistical Analysis Department, ETS Berkeley, for his substantial contributions to prior editions of this report.

[2]See Cowell, W., The California State University English Equivalency Test, May, 1973. Statistical Report SR-74-10, Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, February 1974. See also Bradley, R., Statistical Report. In E. M. White, Comparison and Contrast 1977, Long Beach: Office of the Chancellor, the California State University and Colleges, 1977.

III. Candidate Groups and Norms Samples.

1) Total Group. The 2824 students who took both sections of the English Equivalency Test Comprised the total group. The objective part of the test was taken by 2833 students, of which number 9 failed to take the essay section.

2) Equating Sample. The equating sample consisted of the first 521 papers scored at the essay reading session. All of the essay books from the various test centers were systematically scrambled prior to the reading to insure that they would be read in an essentially random order. Inasmuch as the means and standard deviations of both groups were not significantly different, the equating sample was assumed to be representative of the total group.

	Objective Scores	
	Mean	S. D.
Total Group	47.83	9.25
Equating Sample	48.18	9.47

The data from the equating sample were used to equate (transform) the essay scores to the objective score scale. A sample was used instead of the total group so that computer processing and statistical analysis could be done as the reading session progressed.

3) CLEP Norms Sample. This group consisted of 541 college students who participated in the 1964 norming administration of the CLEP Analysis and Interpretation of Literature examination.

4). Texas Norms Sample. This sample consisted of the 188 students included in the 1970 validity study of the CLEP examination at the University of Texas. Scores on the CLEP test were correlated with final grades in relevant courses.

5) CSUC Norms Samples. The essay questions of the English Equivalency Test were administered to three different groups of California State University students. These essay papers, indistinguishable from regular papers, were interspersed with the candidate essays and scored during the reading session. The average essay scores for students who earned various letter grades in English composition courses were determined, and the information was used to help establish the minimum passing score for the essay part of the examination.

The largest norms sample came from San Jose State University, and consisted of 184 students in English 1B, the second semester of regular composition. California State University, Northridge, contributed a norms sample of 174 students who were enrolled in English 155, the standard one-semester composition course. The smallest sample, containing 130 students, was drawn from California State University, Fresno. This group was enrolled in English 1, the standard one-semester composition course taught at Fresno. For each norms sample, the essay questions were administered to the students during the last several weeks of study designated for the

composition course. Most of the participating professors read the essays and used their own assessment of each student's performance as part of the final course grade. As a motivational technique, students were informed that the essay would have some effect on the course grade. The data from the CSUC norms samples are summarized in Tables 1-3.

IV. The Equating Procedure.

Scores which are expressed on different scales cannot be combined without giving a greater weight to the scores on the scale which has the largest range of numerical values. The raw essay total score scale extends from 0 to 24, while the objective score scale extends from 20 to 80. If scores from these different scales were combined, the objective score would influence the composite score about three times as much as would the raw essay score. A solution to this problem is found by transforming the units of one of the scales so they are numerically equivalent to those of the other scale. This transformation can be performed so that the "equated scale units" represent equal increments in relative position on each of the score scales. Inasmuch as the objective scores were reported on the CLEP scale, the essay scores were transformed to the CLEP scale by means of the equipercentile method of equating. In so doing, a given converted score represents the same percentile rank on both the essay score distribution and the objective score distribution. In other words, equal converted scores on the two parts of the English Equivalency Test represent the same level of performance on each part.

V. Technical Notes on Equating.

1) In the strictest sense, the score transformation procedure was employed to establish scores that are comparable, rather than truly equivalent. The terms "equating" and "equivalent scores' are fully appropriate only when the two tests are parallel forms designed to measure the same psychological function. Because the objective and essay sections of the English Equivalency Test do not measure the same psychological function (see section X), the score transformation technique produces scores which are comparable but not equivalent. However, the mechanics of transformation are exactly the same for producing either comparable or equivalent scores, and the only difference is one in interpretation. For convenience, the term "equating" is used rather than a technically correct phrase, such as "establishing comparable scores."[3]

2) Two basic methods of equating are available, and when the score distributions are very similar in shape, these methods yield almost identical results. Given similar score distributions, the linear method, which defines equivalent scores as those represented by equal standard-score deviates, is preferable. The linear method is completely analytical (determined by a mathematical relationship) and is free from judgments of curve smoothing. However, if the two score distributions differ in shape, the linear method fails to adjust for this difference.[4] Thus, when the distributions have different shapes, or when the shape of one or both distributions is not known or cannot be accurately predicted, the curvilinear or equipercentile method is to be preferred. If the two score distributions differ in shape, the equipercentile method will stretch or compress the score scale of the distribution being converted to fit the shape of the other distribution. This method defines equivalent scores as those scores which represent the same percentile rank on both distributions. Using the score conversion table (Table 4) for illustration, a raw essay score of 14 corresponds to a converted score of 48. The percent of students scoring below 14 on the raw essay scale is the same as the percent scoring below 48 on the objective scale. Thus, in the sense that the two scores represent the same relative rank (percentile) within their distributions, they are equivalent scores.

---

[3] Angoff, W. H. Scales, Norms, and Equivalent Scores. In R. L. Thorndike (Ed.), Educational Measurement, 2nd. ed., Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1971, pp. 562-568; 590-597.

[4] ibid., p. 564.

3) Percentile rank values for each point on the objective score scale were plotted on normal probability graph paper. These points were connected by a smoothed curve, and for the points on the curve corresponding to the percentile rank of each essay score the objective score equivalent was determined.[5]

4) If the two score distributions differ in shape, the use of the equipercentile equating method, as noted above, will modify the essay raw score scale by altering the relative distances of some scores from the median. This modification of the raw score scale will result in a less-than-perfect correlation between raw scores and converted scores. Another factor can also contribute to an imperfect correlation. The equating process is based on a sample of essay scores, but the conversion process is applied to the total population of essay scores. If the shape of the total essay distribution differs slightly from the shape of the sample essay distribution, additional discrepancy may result between the raw score distribution and the converted score distribution. The correlation between raw essay and converted essay scores for the 1978 English Equivalency Test was .9923. In prior years this value has always been above .99, and these very high correlations indicate that the linear equating method could have been used without inducing serious discrepancies between the percentile ranks of equal scores on the converted essay and the objective score scales.

VI. Passing Scores.

1) Basic Passing Scores. An examinee was required to achieve a certain score on both the essay and objective parts of the examination in order to pass. These passing scores were added to arrive at a minimum composite passing score. Data from the CLEP norms sample were used to establish the passing score for the objective part. Whereas for both of these samples the average CLEP score for C students was 49, a score of 49 was set as the passing requirement on the objective part.

For the essay part of the examination, a score of 4 prepresented acceptable performance for a given essay reading. The criteria by which a reader was to distinguish between acceptable (4 or higher) and unacceptable (3 or lower) performance were carefully delineated in training sessions prior to the reading. These criteria represented a consensus among leading State University English professors. Each essay paper had two questions which were given two readings each, for a total of four reading scores. A score of 16 (on the 0 to 24 essay total score scale) thus represents an average score of 4 on each of the four readings. However, inspection of the frequency distribution of essay total scores reveals that only 25.0% scored 16 or higher, indicating that 16 would be a rather rigorous passing score. Also, setting the passing score at 16 would disallow any consideration for error in the scoring process. On the other hand, an essay score of 12 means that the average reading score was 3, or that on the average not one of the four readers found the performance on either of the two questions to be acceptable. A compromise was reached with a raw score of 14, which means that on the average two of the four readers judged the performance to be acceptable. The basic passing score on the essay part of the exam was therefore tentatively set at 14.

The data from the CSUC norms samples (Tables 1-6) were also evaluated in an attempt to set an appropriate and defensible passing score for the essay part of the examination. The basic premise was that the essay passing score should be at least as high as the average essay score of students who earned grades of C in freshman English in the CSUC norms samples. For the San Jose norms sample, the average essay score of C students was 13.74, whereas C students performed at a somewhat lower level at Northridge (12.55) and Fresno (11.75). The superior per-

formance of the San Jose sample may in part be attributable to the fact that these students had received two semesters of instruction in compositon, in contrast to the Northridge and Fresno samples which had received only one semester. In addition, there is some evidence that at Fresno the essay questions may have been administered under conditions which elicited less than optimal motivation; such conditions may have depressed the sample's performance. Inasmuch as students who pass the English Equivalency Test receive credit for two semesters of English, we should expect their performance to be commensurate with that of students who have satisfactorily completed two semesters of composition. For this reason, the San Jose norms sample is the most representative group of the three.

It could also be argued that the essay passing score should be at least as high as the average score achieved by norms sample students who earned a grade of C or higher (A+B+C). For the San Jose sample this value was 14.73. The "C or better" value for Northridge was 13.46, and for Fresno it was 12.84. Thus from the data presented in Tables 1-3 is is evident that a passing score of 14 represents a level of performance a bit higher than that achieved by the "C or higher" students at Fresno and Northridge, and also slightly higher than that achieved by the C students at San Jose.

In addition,it should be noted that grades in freshman English classes may be affected by factors essentially unrelated to writing ability, such as attendance, promptness with assignments, attitudes, and motivation. Given these considerations, the grades earned by students in the norms samples were used only as supplemental evidence in setting the passing score, with primary weight being given to the essay scoring standard developed by the CSUC English professors. Accordingly, the decision to set the basic passing score at 14 represented a consensus among the project directors, chief readers, and consulting statisticians that this score was solidly supported primarily by the carefully developed standards of the SCUC English professors, and secondarily by the performance data in the norms samples.

2) Compensation Model. Although in 1977 compensation was allowed on objective scores only (scores below 49 could pass if accompanied by essay scores above 14), in 1978 the pre-1977 practice of permitting compensation on both objective and essay scores was reintroduced. That is, one of the scores could drop below the passing level if the other score was sufficiently high. Inasmuch as the basic objective passing score was set at 49, and that of the essay was set at 14 (which converted to 48), the composite passing score was set at 97 (49 + 48). The limits within which compensation would operate were then determined by defining scores for both parts which represented absolute minima, below which no compensation could be justified. The objective minimum was set at 45, because this score minimized the number of A, B, and C students who would fail and the number of D and F students who would pass in both the CLEP norms sample and the Texas norms sample.

The essay minimum score was set at 13, which means that at least one reader gave a satisfactory rating on one of the two essays. However, for a candidate to pass on the strength of only one acceptable reading it had to be accompanied by an objective score of 60 or higher, resulting in a composite score of at least 104. (In the CLEP norms sample, 60 was one point less than the average score of

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 516, 571.

A students who had completed a year of study in literature, and represented the 85th percentile rank on the score distribution.)

The limits of compensation, then, were as follows: essay scores of 13, which converted to 44, required an objective score of at least 60 with the resulting composite score of 104 or greater; objective scores of 45 through 48 called for an essay score of at least 15 (which converted to 52) in order to yield the required minimum composite score of 97.

VII. Placement Scores.

This year, following a procedure initiated in 1977, a middle score category called "pass for placement" was designated. Students who did not pass for credit but who scored above a lower set of criteria were granted a recommendation for placement in a standard English composition course, and were also exempted from the English Placement Test (EPT). Students whose scores failed to meet these lower criteria received no recommendation and were required to take the EPT.

A simple conjunctive model was used for the "pass for placement" criteria. That is, no compensation was permitted, and a student had to achieve a certain minimum on both parts of the test. The essay score required for placement was set at 11 (37). A score of 11 can be represented by an average score of 2.75 on each of the four readings, or by three reading scores of 3 and one of 2. The project directors felt that a student who performed at this level exhibited the basic competence necessary for acceptable performance in a standard freshman composition class. The minimum objective score for placement was set at 35. This score represented a somewhat-better-than-chance performance on the multiple choice part of the test, and was indicative of at least minimal competence in reading interpretation.

In addition, all persons who received objective scores below 35 but whose essay scores were 15 (52) or higher were included in the "pass for placement" group. Such a relatively high performance on the essay would argue for the student's readiness for a composition course, regardless of the low objective score. Seven students were added to the placement group on this basis.

VIII. Pass Rates.

1) Objective, Essay, and Total Pass Rates. A total of 2824 students took both parts of the English Equivalency Test. The 1165 students who passed the exam qualified to receive six semester units of credit in freshman English. The percentage of the total group which passed each part of the exam, using the basic pass criteria of 14 on the essay part and 49 on the objective part, is given below. The percentage passing the total exam without compensation (requiring 14 on the essay and 49 on the objective part) and the percentage passing with compensation (as defined in section VI, 2, above) are also listed.

	Objective Test		Essay		Total Exam			
					Without Compensation		With Compensation	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
PASS	1297	45.9	1534	54.3	971	34.4	1165	41.3
NO PASS	1527	54.1	1290	45.7	1853	65.6	1659	58.7

It is evident from these data that a score of 49 on the objective part represents a somewhat more difficult pass criterion than a score of 14 on the essay. Accordingly, although only 25.1% of those students who passed the objective part failed the essay, 36.7% of those students who passed the essay failed the objective part. Expressed as percentages of the total group, 11.5% passed the objective test and failed the essay, and 19.9% passed the essay but failed the objective part. By contrast, in 1977 9.3% passed the objective test but failed the essay, although 27.3% passed the essay but failed the objective part. Thus the rather large disparity between the difficulty levels of the pass criteria in 1977 was diminished in 1978. However, the objective pass criterion yet remains more stringent than the essay criterion. On the other hand, for each year prior to 1976, the pass criterion on the essay had been more rigorous than on the objective part.

2) The effect of Compensation. The effect of the compensatory model was to raise the total pass rate from 34.4% to 41.3%. By scoring 15 or higher on the essay, 174 students with objective scores of 45 through 48 were permitted to pass. In addition, 20 students with essay scores of 13 but whose objective scores were 60 or higher were also allowed to pass.

IX. Technical Notes on Differences Among 1976, 1977, and 1978 Data.

1) Differences in Mean Objective Scores. The average objective score in 1978 (47.83) was .78 points higher than in 1977 (47.05), and 1.09 points lower than in 1976 (48.92). The fact that the CLEP mean scores in 1976 and 1978 were somewhat higher than in 1977 is in part a reflection of the fact that alternate forms of the CLEP test are administered in successive years, and the easier form was used in 1976 and 1978. Prior to 1978, the year-to-year variation in mean scores had consistently been about 2 points, presumably reflecting the difference in the difficulty level of the two forms of the test. However, in 1978 the mean score (as noted above) was only .78 points higher than the prior year, falling more than a full point short of the expected value. The most plausible explanation for this lower value would seem to be a slight drop in the ability level of the 1978 examinees when compared with prior examinee groups.

Although the two forms of the CLEP test have been equated, converted scores on one form of the test evidently do not represent exactly the same level of performance as identical scores on the other form of the test. This inference is based on the likelihood that the two forms may differentially emphasize the measurement of several complex intellectual functions. Thus the conversion resulting from an equating study would not be totally independent of the individuals from whom the data were drawn in developing the conversion, and such a conversion would not necessarily be applicable to all student populations. In summary, one form of the test could be easier than another for a particular student population.

2) Changes in Converted Score Equivalents. For the 1978 data, converted score equivalents for essay scores were slightly higher than those obtained in 1977. For example, in the critical pass-fail range, essay scores of 13, 14, and 15 converted to 40, 43, and 47 in 1977, whereas in 1978 the same essay scores converted to 44, 48, and 52. Factors contributing to these differences in converted score equivalents include the changes in mean objective scores noted above, and year-to-year differences in the mean raw essay essay score. If the essay performance remains constant, a rise in objective scores results in higher converted score equivalents. Thus the effect of the slightly higher objective scores in 1977 was to raise the converted score equivalents. The primary reason, however, for the rise in converted score equivalents was the relatively large decrease in the mean essay score. To illustrate this factor, in 1978 the mean raw essay score (13.72) was .5 raw score points lower than in 1977 (14.21). This drop in the essay scores means that a given essay score in 1978 represented a higher percentile than in 1977, and thus converted to a higher equivalent score on the CLEP (objective) scale.

X. Correlations Between Readings and Between Questions.

The correlation between the scores for the first and second readings of Question 1 was .64, and for Question 2 was .72. These figures, when expanded by the Spearman-Brown formula, represent the reliability of the grading procedure, and are discussed in the section on reliability. The scores for the first reading of Question 1 correlated .39 with the scores for the first reading of Question 2, and the scores for the second reading of both questions correlated .37.

When the two reading scores for each question are combined, the correlation between the question scores is .45. This figure represents the degree of relationship between the two essay questions. Since the proportion of shared variance is indicated by the square of the correlation, only 20% of the variance in each question was shared with the other. This suggests that the two questions drew upon essentially different types of writing ability. However, some of the underlying relationship between the two questions was obscured by the unreliability of the grading. An estimate of the true strength of this relationship can be obtained by removing the effect of the unreliability in the grading procedure. When the influence of grading unreliability is extracted from both questions by a procedure known as "correction for attenuation,"[6] the estimated relationship between the questions is .56. The correction for grading unreliability increases the proportion of shared variance to only 32%, which tends to confirm the inference that the two questions represented different domains of content, and sampled different facets of writing ability which are presumably developed in English Composition classes.

XI. Correlations Between Parts.

Correlations among the objective, raw essay total, and converted essay scores were computed for the total group. The objective and converted essay scores correlated .58, which is about optimal for an examination of this kind. If the relationship were much lower it would be difficult to justify the compensation which is allowed by combining the scores to form a composite. A substantially higher correlation would mean that each part overlapped the other to the extent that the use of both parts sould be redundant.

---

[6]Magnusson, D., Test Theory, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1967, pp. 147-14

The correlation of .99+ between the raw and converted essay scores indicates a strong linear relationship between the scores. As noted above (section V, 4), this high degree of linearity means that the two score distributions are very similar in shape, and the linear equating method could have been used without producing serious distortion.

XII. Reliability.

1) Reliability of the Objective Part. The reliability of the CLEP "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature" examination is .88 as reported in the CLEP Score Interpretation Guide.[7]

2) Reliability of the Essay Part. Because essay tests generally consist of only one or at most several items, it is not possible to compute reliablity by split-half or internal consistency methods. The only alternative is "form-to-form" reliability, which entails giving two equivalent forms of a test to the same group of students. However, the preparation of an equivalent form for a one-or-two question test is not feasible, because one or two questions do not constitute an adequate sample from the domain of content. In lieu of a formal method of computing reliabiity, a method of estimation is available. Upper and lower limits of reliability can be established, with the certainty that the actual value lies somewhere between the two limits.

3) The Upper Limit. The correlation between grades on the first and second readings of each essay question represents the reliability of the grading procedure. Since unreliability due to grading is only one of several sources of error variance, the value for grading reliablity will always be higher than the overall reliablity value which includes all sources of error variance. Thus, grading reliablity can be used as the upper limit of overall or actual reliability. For Question 1, the correlation between grades on both readings is .64, and for Question 2 the correlation is .72. These values are the reliablities of a single reading. That is, the reliability of each reading of Question 1 is .64. Adding the reading scores to obtain a question score produces an increase in reliability, which is estimated by the Spearman-Brown formula.[8] The estimated reliability for Question 1 is .78, and that for Question 2 is ,84.

Because the essay total score is the sum of the question scores, the reading reliability for the total is higher than that for either of the questions. The reading reliability of the essay total score is most appropriately estimated by the formula for computing the reliability of a linear composite, inasmuch as the two questions (as established above) are not alternative forms representing the same domain of content.[9] The reading reliability of the essay total score is estimated to be .87, and this value is taken as the upper limit of reliability for the total essay test.

4) The Lower Limit. The obtained correlation between Question 1 and Question 2 is used to estimate the lower limit of reliability. If each question were treated as a one-question test, the actual reliability per question could be obtained by giving an equivalent form of a question and correlating scores on

---

[7] Score Interpretation Guide, College-Level Examination Program, Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1967, p. 31.

[8] Magnusson, op. cit., p. 74.

[9] Nunnally, J., Psychometric Theory, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967, pp. 226-230.

both forms. Unreliability due both to grading and to fluctuations in performance would be reflected in such a "form-to-form" coefficient. It has already been demonstrated that Question 1 and Question 2 are not equivalent in terms of content. To the extent that the two questions are not equivalent, the correlation between them will underestimate the actual reliability of the question scores.

The correlation between the scores in Question 1 and Question 2 is .45. Again, because the essay total score includes both questions, the reliability of the total will be higher, and is estimated by the linear composite method to be .62. The actual reliability of the essay test therefore lies between the lower limit of .62 and the upper limit of .87.

5) Reliability of the Composite Scores. The estimated reliability of the composite scores, based on reliability coefficients of .88 for the objective part and between .62 and .87 for the essay part, is between .84 and .92.

6) Reliability in Terms of Reading Score Discrepancies. Another way of expressing the reliability of the essay scores is to indicate the frequency and magnitude of the discrepancies between the two reading scores for each question. Inasmuch as each of the 2824 candidates wrote two essays and each essay was read twice, there were 2824 pairs of scores for each of the two questions. And, as the scores for each reading ranged from 0 to 6, the discrepancy between the two scores in each pair could range from 0 to 6. However, differences of more than 2 points were always resolved by a third reading. Two-point differences were allowed to stand, unless one reading was pass and the other was fail; that is, unless the scores were 5-3 or 4-2. In such cases, a third reading resolved the difference by taking the middle value for both scores or by assigning one of the values for both scores.

For Question 1, 53.4% of the score pairs had no discrepancy. A discrepancy of one point occurred in 45.3% of the pairs, and a discrepancy of two points occurred in only 1.3% of the cases. For Question 2, the figures were 53.2% for no difference, 44.2% for a one-point difference, and 2.6% for a two-point difference. For the total of 5648 pairs of reading scores, the percentages were as follows: no difference, 53.3%; one-point difference, 44.7%; two-point difference, 1.9%. In summary, the two reading scores were either identical or differed by only one point in 98.1% of the cases, and two-point differences occurred in the remaining 1.9% of the cases.

XIII. Validity.

1) Validity of the Objective Part. Course grades or other indicators of classroom achievement can be correlated with test scores to obtain measures of concurrent validity. The CLEP Score Interpretation Guide reports correlations between scores on the "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature" examination and course grades before and after the final examination; the values are .42 and .54, respectively. As noted in the CLEP Guide,[10] these correlations should be interpreted with caution because of lack of uniformity in the procedures by which the data were obtained.

---

[10] op. cit., pp. 33, 34.

2) Validity of the Essay Part. English composition grades earned by students in the CSUC norms samples were correlated with essay total scores. As noted earlier, each professor's own ratings of his students' essays were used, in most cases and to varying degrees, as part of the course grade. In general, the weight attached to the essays was not large, so that the essay/grade correlations are not seriously inflated. It should also be noted that the scores assigned at the essay reading (which were used to compute the correlations reported below) had no influence on the course grade. For the Northridge sample, the essay/grade correlation was .50; for the San Jose sample the correlation was .46, and for the Fresno sample the value was only .34. Inasmuch as class grades may be affected by factors unrelated to competence, such as absences or incomplete assignments, the instructors were also asked to rank their students on a six-point scale of general ability in the course. It was anticipated that the ranks would more accurately reflect the students' abilities than would the course grades, resulting in higher correlations with the essay scores. Although in prior years this expectation has not been consistently realized, in 1978 the essay/rank correlations were slightly higher than the essay/grade correlations for each norms sample. The essay/rank correlations were .53 for Northridge,.48 for San Jose, and .43 for Fresno. Correlations between essay scores and both grades and ranks were a little higher in 1978 than in previous years. The increase may in part reflect additional efforts made this year to insure that the norms sample participants were adequately motivated. It should be noted that all the values cited in this section reflect unreliability in grading due to the various standards used by different instructors, and should be interpreted only as gross approximations, if not as underestimates, of concurrent validity.

TABLE 1

NORMS SAMPLE, SAN JOSE

English 1B, Second Semester

Grade	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
A	23	16.09	2.62	9-21
B	68	15.41	2.33	10-20
C	78	13.74	2.48	5-18
D	14	10.93	2.28	7-14
F	1	13.00	0	0
A + B	91	15.58	2.24	9-21
A + B + C	169	14.73	2.61	5-21
C + D	92	13.32	2.65	5-18
D + F	15	11.07	2.26	7-14
TOTAL	184	14.43	2.77	5-21

Table 2

NORMS SAMPLE, NORTHRIDGE

English 155, One Semester

Grade	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
A	21	15.28	2.12	10-19
B	66	13.89	2.63	9-20
C	74	12.55	2.43	6-17
D	9	8.44	2.27	5-13
F	4	9.50	1.66	7-11
A + B	87	14.23	2.59	9-20
A + B + C	161	13.46	2.65	6-20
C + D	83	12.11	2.73	5-17
D + F	13	8.77	2.15	5-13
TOTAL	174	13.11	2.89	5-20

Table 3

NORMS SAMPLE, FRESNO

English 1, One Semester

Grade	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
A	24	13.67	3.45	6-20
B	46	13.72	3.13	4-19
C	55	11.74	2.60	4-18
D	4	10.25	1.09	9-12
F	2	5.00	0	0
A + B	70	13.70	3.24	4-20
A + B + C	125	12.84	3.13	4-20
C + D	59	11.64	2.56	4-18
D + F	5	9.20	2.31	5-12
TOTAL	130	12.70	3.18	4-20

TABLE 4

SCORE CONVERSION TABLE

May 1978

Essay Total Score	-	Converted Score
24	-	80
23	-	77
22	-	74
21	-	71
20	-	68
19	-	64
18	-	60
17	-	58
16	-	55
15	-	52
14	-	48
13	-	44
12	-	40
11	-	37
10	-	35
9	-	33
8	-	30
7	-	28
6	-	26
5	-	25
4	-	24
3	-	23
2	-	22
1	-	21
0	-	20

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION 1977-78

BUDGET SUMMARY

Start-Up Costs:

Personal Services	$22,786
Operating Expenses	12,604
TOTAL	35,390

Note: The above includes administrative time, secretarial and student assistant help, printing (brochure and essay test questions), mailing, and travel (including that of various faculty committees).

Reading Costs:

Readers and Professional Team	$15,900
Aides	1,420
Operating Costs	9,763
TOTAL	$27,083

Note: The above operating expenses include transportation and per diem.

Follow-Up Costs:

Summer Administration and Preparation of Final Report	$ 6,427

Assistance underwritten by The California State University and Colleges campuses of San Jose, Pomona, and San Bernardino; and by the Office of the Chancellor.

Office Space, San Jose and San Bernardino
Telephone Usage, San Jose
Computer Time, Pomona
Key Punch Operator, Pomona
Statistician, Pomona
Computer Time for Follow-Up Study, Chancellor's Office
Development of Follow-Up Study, Chancellor's Office

APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF STUDENT SOURCE OF INFORMATION ON THE ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION

A continuing concern, and continuing major expense, is the extensive publicity necessary to reach those who will take the English Equivalency Examination. Each year, close to 100,000 brochures are printed and distributed; the brochures describe the EEE, give a series of questions and answers about the program, and include a registration form with directions about when and where to take the test (see Comparison and Contrast, 1975, pp 7-10). These brochures are the major means of publicity and information for the EEE, and are sent to students by various methods, most particularly by CSUC admissions and testing offices and by high school counselors and English teachers.

Attempts to inform high school and college students about the examination have been increasingly successful as the program has become established. CSUC admissions offices have been notifying all admitted freshmen, and mailing lists to high schools have become more sophisticated. However, attempts to reach those not now in school have been less effective. While press releases and radio spot announcements have been sent out each year, and posters and brochures have been sent to public libraries, relatively few students over the age of 20 (about ten percent of the group) appear to take the examination.

A major problem in publicizing the EEE is the difficulty in knowing how much encouragement to offer prospective test takers. Since the test is very demanding, it would not only be demeaning but unfair to promise easy college credits; at the same time, an emphasis on the difficulty of the test is bound to discourage some who might well deserve to pass. The uneasy compromise on the brochure and in the various other publicity materials is honest, but not of a sort to raise much enthusiasm.

Furthermore, the relative failure to enlist many over the age of 20 to take the EEE may not be a failure of communication. It is by no means clear that there is a large demand for credit by examination by working adults in California, although such a demand has frequently been hypothesized or assumed. It may be that the large scale recruiting efforts made in recent years by public higher education, and in particular by over 100 California community colleges, has reached most adults interested in college work. Nonetheless, attempts to inform interested adults about the EEE ought to continue, since several hundred do show up each year to take the test.

A summary of a questionnaire distributed and collected at the test sites in 1978 reveals the results of the efforts in 1978 to inform those who might benefit from the EEE about the test program.

QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Please indicate how you first learned about the English Equivalency Examination by checking one of the items below.

227	1.	High school counselor
599	2.	High school English teacher
43	3.	Poster at school
6	4.	Poster at public library
128	5.	Friends
10	6.	Newspaper
6	7.	TV
1	8.	Radio
1537	9.	Application mailed to my home
221	10.	Other
TOTAL 2778		

B. Where did you get your application? Please check one of the items below.

362	1.	High school counselor/counseling office
382	2.	High school English teacher/English department office
1736	3.	In the mail from a college campus
257	4.	At a California State University Admissions or Testing office
42	5.	Other (please specify)
TOTAL 2779		

These figures confirm the 1975 survey (see Comparison and Contrast, 1975, pp 99-100) results in relation to the public media. While TV, radio, and newspaper announcements and articles no doubt increase program and CSUC visibility, and, perhaps, prestige, only one half of one percent of those who enroll for the EEE hear about it through the media. Public libraries, an apparently obvious way to reach the adult population, informed only 6 students who showed up. Once again, the most important sources of information turned out to be the high school teachers and counselors, and the mailing from the CSUC admissions offices.

Every survey, of course, has its comic replies. Here, the opportunity for wit came in response to question B, item 5, "other." One student claimed to have discovered the EEE application form in a trash can, and another seems to have discovered this route to advanced college credit at Dodger Stadium. While these replies suggest new ways to publicize the EEE, it seems unlikely that new funds will be available in these hard times to expand efforts in these directions.

APPENDIX C

REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH COUNCIL TEST COMMITTEE
ON THE 1978 CSUC ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION

October 26, 27 1978

The administration of the 1978 examination remained generally unchanged from the previous five years. In addition to the Analysis and Interpretation of Literature examination students wrote two forty-five minute essays developed by two CSUC Test Development Committees. The essay questions were scored in the usual manner by question leaders, table leaders and 36 readers from CSUC English departments. The number of students taking the test this year was significantly larger than last year (2824 vs. 2216), reversing a trend of declining enrollment. Of these, 1165 (41.3%) passed for full credit and 1149 (44.2%) did well enough to be exempted from the English Placement Test. The already high consistency rate of past readings was improved upon this year despite a shorter time scheme. Higher enrollment meant that more new and experienced readers were able to participate in the valuable experience of essay scoring.

Follow-up studies are continuing for the five years of the program. An additional $12,000 is needed for the five-year study of students who took the test in 1972 and has been requested. In the five years of the program 18,922 tests have been completed; by the end of the year some 45,000 semester units of credit will have been granted. The program and its procedures are attracting more national attention--the forthcoming issue of The Journal of Basic Writing will discuss the EEE and refer readers to the annual Comparision and Contrast reports for information on procedures. The directors are to be commended for the conduct of the test this year and for the credit their methods have brought to our system.

A number of other issues have arisen concerning the test which the Council may want to consider. The first has to do with (what else?) money. Students now pay $20 to take the test, all of which is paid to ETS for the Analysis and Interpretation of Literature. The money provided for essay development and scoring has been increasing at a decreasing rate and it is conceivable that budget cuts could threaten this portion of the program. Can we, or should we, develop our own multiple choice test? Or, can we charge students more for the test to help pay for essay scoring? It might be well for the Council to consider these, or other alternatives in case the accustomed level of funding does not continue.

As inconceivable as it may seem, Ed White has suggested that he may not always want to continue as director of EEE. The Council may want to consider the procedure by which his successor should be appointed. Ed can clarify this situation further, but there apparently could be some ambiguity involving the Council and the Chancellor's office as to who is responsible for the appointment.

Finally, the director has requested the test committee to recommend that writing samples gathered on the various campuses for the purpose of establishing norms for the essay portion of the EEE not be used for making comparisons between writing programs. Such comparisions could have an inhibiting effect on the widespread voluntary participation necessary to establish the validity of the essay scoring. We recommend that norm statistics be used only to establish a passing level on the essay test.

Dr. J. Barry Dalsant
CSU Humboldt

APPENDIX D

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

DISTRIBUTION OF CONVERTED ESSAY SCORES
OF THE TOTAL APPLICANT POPULATION

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
22-24	13	0.5	0.5
25-29	39	1.4	1.8
30-34	129	4.6	6.4
35-39	378	13.4	19.8
40-44	731	25.9	45.7
45-49	455	16.1	61.8
50-54	374	13.2	75.0
55-59	469	16.6	91.6
60-64	173	6.1	97.8
65-69	27	1.0	98.7
70-74	30	1.1	99.8
75-79	5	0.2	100.0
80	1	0.0	100.0
Total	2824	100.0	–

Mean = 47.0 Median = 48 Standard Deviation = 9.2

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

DISTRIBUTION OF CONVERTED ESSAY SCORES
OF THOSE PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDITS

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
44	20	1.7	1.7
48	223	19.1	20.9
52	296	25.4	46.3
55	235	20.2	66.4
58	164	14.1	80.5
60	111	9.5	90.0
64	53	4.5	94.6
68	27	2.3	96.9
71	23	2.0	98.9
74	7	0.6	99.5
77	5	0.4	99.9
80	1	0.1	100.0
Total	1165	100.0	–

Mean = 54.9 Median = 55 Standard Deviation = 5.9

67

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

DISTRIBUTION OF CONVERTED ESSAY SCORES
OF PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
22-24	13	0.8	0.8
25-29	39	2.4	3.1
30-34	129	7.8	10.9
35-39	378	22.8	33.7
40-44	711	42.9	76.6
45-49	232	14.0	90.5
50-54	78	4.7	95.2
55-59	70	4.2	99.5
60-64	9	0.5	100.0
Total	1659	100.0	–

Mean = 41.4 Median = 40 Standard Deviation = 6.8

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

DISTRIBUTION OF CONVERTED ESSAY SCORES
OF PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
37-39	198	8.2	8.2
40-44	694	28.8	37.1
45-49	443	18.4	55.5
50-54	370	15.4	70.8
55-59	467	19.4	90.4
60-64	172	7.1	97.4
65-69	27	1.1	98.5
70-74	30	1.2	99.8
75-79	5	0.2	100.0
80	1	0.0	100.0
Total	2407	100.0	–

Mean = 49.8 Median = 49 Standard Deviation = 8.1

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

DISTRIBUTION OF CONVERTED ESSAY SCORES
OF PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
22-24	13	3.1	3.1
25-29	39	9.4	12.5
30-34	129	30.9	43.4
35-39	180	43.2	86.6
40-44	37	8.9	95.4
45-49	12	2.9	98.3
50-54	4	1.0	99.3
55-59	2	0.5	99.8
60	1	0.2	100.0
Total	417	100.0	–

Mean = 34.3 Median = 35 Standard Deviation = 5.4

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

70

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
45-47	119	10.2	10.2
48-50	175	15.0	25.2
51-53	225	19.3	44.5
54-56	194	16.7	61.2
57-59	150	12.9	74.1
60-62	134	11.5	85.6
63-65	97	8.3	93.9
66-68	47	4.0	97.9
69-71	21	1.8	99.7
72-74	3	0.3	100.0
Total	1165	100.0	–

Mean = 55.2 Median = 54.8 Standard Deviation = 6.2

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

71

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVE SCORES OF
THE TOTAL APPLICANT POPULATION

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-24	6	0.2	0.2
25-29	57	2.0	2.2
30-34	155	5.5	7.7
35-39	324	11.4	19.1
40-44	524	18.5	37.6
45-49	588	20.8	58.4
50-54	454	16.0	74.4
55-59	399	14.1	88.5
60-64	229	8.1	96.6
65-69	83	2.9	99.5
70-74	15	0.5	100.0
Total	2833	100.0	–

Mean = 47.8 Median = 48 Standard Deviation = 9.3

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

72

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVE SCORES OF
PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-24	5	0.3	0.3
25-29	54	3.3	3.6
30-34	155	9.3	12.9
35-39	323	19.5	32.4
40-44	522	31.5	63.8
45-49	335	20.2	84.0
50-54	146	8.8	92.8
55-59	95	5.7	98.6
60-64	19	1.1	99.7
65-68	5	0.3	100.0
Total	1659	100.0	–

Mean = 42.6 Median = 43 Standard Deviation = 7.4

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVE SCORES OF
PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
35-39	245	10.2	10.2
40-44	455	18.9	29.1
45-49	553	23.0	52.1
50-54	441	18.3	70.4
55-59	390	16.2	86.6
60-64	225	9.3	95.9
65-69	83	3.4	99.4
70-74	15	0.6	100.0
Total	2407	100.0	–

Mean = 50.0 Median = 49 Standard Deviation = 81

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVE SCORES OF
PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
22-24	4	1.0	1.0
25-29	54	12.9	13.9
30-34	155	37.2	51.1
35-39	79	18.9	70.0
40-44	67	16.1	86.1
45-49	33	7.9	94.0
50-54	13	3.1	97.1
55-59	9	2.2	99.3
60-63	3	0.7	100.0
Total	417	100.0	–

Mean = 36.5 Median = 34 Standard Deviation = 7.4

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPOSITE SCORES OF
THE TOTAL PARTICIPANT POPULATION

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
49	3	0.1	0.1
50-59	37	1.3	1.4
60-69	142	5.0	6.4
70-79	332	11.8	18.2
80-89	557	19.7	37.9
90-99	641	22.7	60.6
100-109	592	21.0	81.6
110-119	338	12.0	93.6
120-129	135	4.8	98.3
130-139	40	1.4	99.8
140-148	7	0.2	100.0
Total	2824	100.0	–

Mean = 94.8 Median = 95 Standard Deviation = 16.4

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPOSITE SCORES OF THOSE PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
97-99	126	10.8	10.8
100-104	250	21.5	32.3
105-109	269	23.1	55.4
110-114	179	15.4	70.7
115-119	159	13.6	84.4
120-124	93	8.0	92.4
125-129	42	3.6	96.0
130-134	19	1.6	97.6
135-139	21	1.8	99.4
140-144	4	0.3	99.7
145-148	3	0.3	100.0
Total	1165	100.0	–

Mean = 110.0 Median = 108 Standard Deviation = 9.5

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPOSITE SCORES OF THOSE PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
49	3	0.2	0.2
50-54	14	0.8	1.0
55-59	23	1.4	2.4
60-64	50	3.0	5.4
65-69	92	5.5	11.0
70-74	137	8.3	19.2
75-79	195	11.8	31.0
80-84	250	15.1	46.1
85-89	307	18.5	64.6
90-94	275	16.6	81.1
95-99	240	14.5	95.6
100-104	69	4.2	99.8
105-108	4	0.2	100.0
Total	1659	100.0	–

Mean = 84.1 Median = 85 Standard Deviation = 10.9

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPOSITE SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT PASS FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
49	3	0.7	0.7
50-54	14	3.4	4.1
55-59	23	5.5	9.6
60-64	49	11.8	21.3
65-69	92	22.1	43.4
70-74	108	25.9	69.3
75-79	65	15.6	84.9
80-84	37	8.9	93.8
85-89	18	4.3	98.1
90-94	6	1.4	99.5
95-98	2	0.5	100.0
Total	417	100.0	–

Mean = 70.8 Median = 71 Standard Deviation = 8.7

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPOSITE SCORES OF
THOSE PARTICIPANTS WHO PASSED FOR CREDIT OR PLACEMENT

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
64-69	1	0.0	0.0
70-79	159	6.6	6.6
80-89	502	20.9	27.5
90-99	633	26.3	53.8
100-109	592	24.6	78.4
110-119	338	14.0	92.4
120-129	135	5.6	98.0
130-139	40	1.7	99.7
140-148	7	0.3	100.0
Total	2407	100.0	–

Mean = 99.0 Median = 98 Standard Deviation = 13.7

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

TOTAL APPLICANTS BY AGE

Age	Non-Passers			Age	Placement Passers			Age	Credit Passers			Age	Total		
	N	Rel. %	Cum. %		N	Rel. %	Cum. %		N	Rel. %	Cum. %		N	Rel. %	Cum. %
16 & Under	3	0.7	0.7	16 & Under	2	0.2	0.2	16 & Under	4	0.3	0.3	16 & Under	9	0.3	0.3
17	22	5.3	6.0	17	75	6.1	6.3	17	89	7.7	8.0	17	186	6.6	6.9
18	318	76.4	82.4	18	950	77.0	83.3	18	846	73.1	81.1	18	2114	75.3	82.2
19	45	10.8	93.2	19	148	12.0	95.3	19	82	7.1	88.2	19	275	9.8	92.0
20	4	1.0	94.2	20	8	0.6	95.9	20	19	1.6	89.8	20	31	1.1	93.1
21	4	1.0	95.2	21	7	0.6	96.5	21	13	1.1	90.9	21	24	0.9	94.0
22	3	0.7	95.9	22	7	0.6	97.1	22	11	0.9	91.8	22	21	0.7	94.7
23	1	0.2	96.1	23	5	0.4	97.5	23	12	1.0	92.8	23	18	0.6	95.4
24	0	0.0	96.1	24	5	0.4	97.9	24	7	0.6	93.4	24	12	0.4	95.8
25-29	2	0.5	96.6	25-29	7	0.6	98.5	25-29	27	2.3	95.7	25-29	36	1.3	97.1
30-34	2	0.5	97.1	30-34	2	0.2	98.7	30-34	11	0.9	96.6	30-34	15	0.5	97.6
35 & Over	12	2.9	100.0	35 & Over	18	1.5	100.0	35 & Over	37	3.2	100.0	35 & Over	67	2.4	100.0
All Ages	416	100.0	–	All Ages	1234	100.0	–	All Ages	1158	100.0	–	All Ages	2808	100.0	–

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

FEMALE APPLICANTS BY AGE

Age	Non-Passers			Age	Placement Passers			Age	Credit Passers			Age	Total		
	N	Rel. %	Cum. %		N	Rel. %	Cum. %		N	Rel. %	Cum. %		N	Rel. %	Cum. %
16 & Under	2	0.9	0.9	16 & Under	2	0.3	0.3	16 & Under	4	0.5	0.5	16 & Under	8	0.5	0.5
17	18	8.2	9.1	17	53	7.4	7.7	17	59	7.4	7.9	17	130	7.5	8.0
18	166	75.8	84.9	18	553	77.5	85.2	18	590	74.1	82.0	18	1309	75.7	83.7
19	23	10.5	95.4	19	79	11.1	96.2	19	52	6.5	88.6	19	154	8.9	92.6
20	1	0.5	95.9	20	4	0.6	96.8	20	11	1.4	89.9	20	16	0.9	93 5
21	3	1.4	97.3	21	3	0.4	97.2	21	8	1.0	91.0	21	14	0.8	94 3
22	0	0.0	97.3	22	5	0.7	97.9	22	9	1.1	92.1	22	14	0.8	95.1
23	0	0.0	97.3	23	3	0.4	98.3	23	10	1.3	93.3	23	13	0.8	95.9
24	0	0.0	97.3	24	1	0.1	98.5	24	3	0.4	93.7	24	4	0.2	96.1
25-29	1	0.5	97.7	25-29	4	0.6	99.0	25-29	18	2.3	96.0	25-29	23	1.3	97 5
30-34	1	0.5	98.2	30-34	1	0.1	99.2	30-34	8	1.0	97.0	30-34	10	0.6	98 0
35 & Over	4	1.8	100.0	35 & Over	6	0.8	100.0	35 & Over	24	3.0	100.0	35 & Over	34	2.0	100.0
All Ages	219	100.0	–	All Ages	714	100.0	–	All Ages	796	100.0	–	All Ages	1729	100.0	–

*Sex data unobtainable from 33 applicants

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

MALE APPLICANTS BY AGE

Age	Non-Passers			Age	Placement Passers			Age	Credit Passers			Age	Total		
	N	Rel. %	Cum. %		N	Rel. %	Cum. %		N	Rel. %	Cum. %		N	Rel. %	Cum. %
16 & Under	1	0.5	0.5	16 & Under	0	0.0	0.0	16 & Under	0	0.0	0.0	16 & Under	1	0.1	0.1
17	4	2.1	2.6	17	22	4.4	4.4	17	29	8.2	8.2	17	55	5.3	5.4
18	152	77.9	80.5	18	385	77.2	81.6	18	254	72.2	80.4	18	791	75.6	81.0
19	21	10.8	91.3	19	68	13.6	95.2	19	30	8.5	88.9	19	119	11.4	92.4
20	3	1.5	92.8	20	4	0.8	96.0	20	8	2.3	91.2	20	15	1.4	93.8
21	1	0.5	93.3	21	4	0.8	96.8	21	5	1.4	92.6	21	10	1.0	94.7
22	3	1.5	94.9	22	2	0.4	97.2	22	2	0.6	93.2	22	7	0.7	95.4
23	1	0.5	95.4	23	2	0.4	97.6	23	2	0.6	93.8	23	5	0.5	95.9
24	0	0.0	95.4	24	4	0.8	98.4	24	4	1.1	94.9	24	8	0.8	96.7
25-29	1	0.5	95.9	25-29	3	0.6	99.0	25-29	9	2.6	97.4	25-29	13	1.2	97.9
30-34	1	0.5	96.4	30-34	1	0.2	99.2	30-34	2	0.6	98.0	30-34	4	0.4	98.3
35 & Over	7	3.6	100.0	35 & Over	4	0.8	100.0	35 & Over	7	2.0	100.0	35 & Over	18	1.7	100.0
All Ages	195	100.0	–	All Ages	499	100.0	–	All Ages	352	100.0	–	All Ages	1046	100.0	–

*Sex data unobtainable from 33 applicants

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG GROUPED ESSAY AND COMPOSITE SCORES
FOR THE TOTAL APPLICANT POPULATION

	Question 1	Question 2	Essay Total	Conv. Essay	Objective	Composite
Question 1		0.4804	0.8187	0.8094	0.4321	0.6950
Question 2			0.8827	0.8782	0.5591	0.8065
Essay Total				0.9923	0.5843	0.8857
Converted Essay					0.5820	0.8887
Objective						0.8900

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION – SPRING 1978

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG PART AND COMPOSITE SCORES
FOR THE TOTAL APPLICANT POPULATION

	Essay No. 1		Essay No. 2					
	Read 1	Read 2	Read 1	Read 2	Essay Total	Essay Conv.	Objective	Composite
Essay No. 1								
Read 1		0.5983	0.4013	0.3327	0.7273	0.7194	0.3816	0.6147
Read 2			0.4073	0.3812	0.7268	0.7183	0.3910	0.6196
Essay No. 2								
Read 1				0.6759	0.8117	0.8083	0.5286	0.7494
Read 2					0.7985	0.7938	0.4949	0.7219
Essay Total						0.9923	0.5843	0.8857
Essay Conv.							0.5820	0.8887
Objective								0.8900

TCSUC – Institutional Research
January 1979